

Humanist

World Digest

Vol. 28, No. 1
FEBRUARY, 1956

1011 Heinz Avenue
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

COPY 25c
\$1.00 A YEAR

THE HUMANIST CONTRIBUTION TO RELIGION

Rev. Eugene W. Kreves

Church and State News Report Part II.

The Common Front

Dr. William Edward Zeuch

NEWS AND VIEWS

IDEALS TO LIVE BY

THE IDEAL OF HUMANISM

We are seeking to present Humanism as a religious philosophy which denies no particular faith, but which provides a path over which all people can travel toward a unity that rises above the barriers of the beliefs which divide them. In behalf of this common faith, we emphasize a constructive approach rather than opposition to traditional philosophies.

PUBLISHED BY THE HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP,
INCORPORATED IN CALIFORNIA AS A NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
FOR EDUCATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS PURPOSES.

TEN AIMS OF HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP

- 1—Full endorsement of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the Plenary meeting December 10, 1948, and world-wide implementation and fulfillment of those rights at the earliest possible moment.
- 2—The use of science to serve society, creatively, constructively, and altruistically in the preservation of life, the production of abundance of goods and services, and the promotion of health and happiness.
- 3—The establishment and furthering of scientific integral education in all schools and colleges so as to emancipate all peoples from the thralldom of ignorance, superstition, prejudices and myths which impede individual development and forestall social progress.
- 4—The widest promotion of the creative arts so as to release all potential artistic abilities and raise the general level of artistic appreciation.
- 5—The increase of social, recreational and travel activities in order to broaden the outlook and improve the intercultural understanding among all peoples.
- 6—A quickened conservation of the world's natural resources, including human resources, so as to arrest their wasteful exhaustion and wanton destruction and thus insure their longest preservation and widest beneficial use for man's survival on this planet.
- 7—The inauguration of a world-wide economy of abundance through national economic planning and international economic cooperation so as to provide a shared plenty for all peoples.
- 8—The advancement of the good life on the basis of a morality determined by historical human experience and contemporary scientific research.
- 9—The development of a coordinated private, cooperative and public medical program which will provide preventive as well as curative medicine and include adequate public health education and personal health counseling.
- 10—The expansion of United Nations functions (1) to include international police power with sufficient armed forces to prevent war and (2) international economic controls capable of preventing world-wide monopolies and/or cartels.

(Successor to WELCOME NEWS)
HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST

A Quarterly of Liberal Religion

E. O. Corson, Editor. Editorial Associates: William E. Zeuch, Dr. Phillip B. Oliver, Dr. Norval E. Packwood. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Berkeley, California, under the act of March 3, 1879. Publication Committee: Dr. Harold Scott, chairman; Kenneth S. Brown, vice-chairman; Edward L. Ericson. E. O. Corson, Business Manager. Subscription Rate: \$1.00 per year. Vol. 28, No. 1, January-February-March, 1956. All rights reserved. The Humanist World Digest, 1011 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley, California.

The responsibility of signed articles in this magazine is accepted by the writers and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Humanist World Digest. Permission granted for reproduction of original articles when proper credit is given.

THE HUMANIST CONTRIBUTION TO RELIGION

By Rev. Eugene W. Kreves

The term "humanist" is in need of clarification, primarily because it is considered a profane word in most religious circles. The term also requires a clarification because some who take the name humanist are not at all humane or humanitarian in personality.

John Galsworthy said of humanism:

"Humanism is the creed of those who believe that, within the circle of enwrapping mystery, men's fates are in their own hands—a faith that is becoming for modern man the only possible faith."

Julian Huxley has defined the humanist as:

"... one whose real faith is in the possibilities of human experience and achievement.

Man has the possibility of making progress the main feature of his own future evolution, and of guiding its course in relation to a deliberate aim.

Man stands alone as the agent of his fate and the trustee of progress for life. To accept his responsibility consciously is itself an important step toward more rapid progress."

Rudolf Dreikurs says of humanism:

"Humanism, in our sense, derives its meaning from its belief in man and his potentialities. It is the doctrine that man's obligations are limited to, and dependent alone on man and human relations; that man's nature is perfectible through his own efforts without divine grace. Consequently, Humanism relies on the scientific method and does not depend on or look for revelation.

Humanism, as I use the term, is in part the philosophy which declares that man is very much on his own in his struggle for the good life. That is, whatever external help there may be, is not in terms of a Cosmic Companion to whom we must speak in order to receive assistance and before whom we must pros-

trate ourselves before we will be forgiven. Some humanists declare that the universe is indifferent to man. That conviction I, personally, do not share. If the course of evolution were not conducive to the appearance and the continuance of man, man would not have evolved and would not at present exist. That the universe responds to the man who seeks to manipulate it through sacred words or rites of course is demonstrably false, but one should not infer from that fact that the human species lives in a hostile or even an indifferent universe.

Further, some humanists sanction the scientific approach to life because of its purported utility, thinking science valuable because it enables one to exploit nature. That attitude sanctioning the exploitation of nature is most superficial and helps make man into a parasite, extracting him from his rightful orientation in nature and stripping him of the last traces of the religious spirit. Some humanists have to learn that "progress" made towards severing man from nature is regress. Nature is not to be the subject of exploitation, but of reverence. When man becomes integrated in the vast cycles of nature, he is no master. The aspect of humanism which we are seeking to explore is that of a religious naturalism which disavows supernaturalism but which does not separate human nature from nature. Those humanists who do make such a separation are as artificial in their values as the supernatural religionists whom they despise and deride.

The popular conception of humanism in the circles of religious believers is that humanism is a starry-eyed conception of man which takes no cognizance of human sinfulness, makes man into a kind of god and is superficial. The religious believers think that humanism must be crushed before man can be saved. Humanism is considered to be godless and if not immoral, at least non-moral, or unmoral.

The popular conception of religion in some humanist quarters is that religion is the creation of weak-minded superstitious elements in human society, that God, far from being the greatest invention of man is one of the worst and most harmful of human illusions and that the clergy are the custodians and guardians of intellectual and emotional corruption.

In this the consistent humanist may be correct, and the seeker after truth may be forced to remain content with the mystery process.

The major humanist contribution to religion has been its negative rejection of inadequate theology; its humanitarian emphasis

in place of a preoccupation with theology has been its positive contribution.

Is a humanist a Christian? Obviously not, for the same reason I believe Unitarians are not. No humanist believes in a supernatural Savior whose blood in some mysterious manner washes away human sin. Religious humanists have reverence for the man Jesus, but not for the Christ created by the superstitious who lacked faith in man.

Do humanists believe in God? John H. Dietrich the "father" of humanism said, "I believe in God", "I don't use the word very often, because it's so easily misinterpreted. but if I can define the word myself, I believe in God." "Humanism does not exclude the idea of God." Some humanists do believe in the reality of an impersonal life force which is greater than man, yet within man. Some would and some would not be willing to call this reality God. Humanism has been a cleansing agent. It has been the broom which has swept out a lot of theological rubbish. It has helped men to see that the value of prayer is subjective and that verbal prayer should not be addressed to a Supreme Being apart from man. With the rise of humanism we have had worship services which are no longer an insult to the intelligence of man.

Although humanism has been forced to approach religion from a negative standpoint, its devotion to truth is a sterling religious quality, and by its denial of the false claims of supernaturalism, it has purified and strengthened religion.

I personally believe that the weakness of humanism is its conscious surrender of metaphysics to the theologians; its negative approach to nature. Nevertheless, humanism is a long step in the right direction, and we may rejoice that that philosophy is gaining power not only within Unitarianism but also within our culture. Let us be aware, however, that we need to go beyond a man-centered humanism if we are to find a full and satisfying realistic philosophy of life.

The goal of religious humanism is a society freed from superstition and social exploitation. The job which history has given humanism is not simply the negative task of repudiating orthodox religion. It is also the job of creating a newer and better expression of religion which will open to man broad intellectual and social and economic horizons. This new religion must meet the requirements of a free democratic society in an industrial-atomic age. It must be founded upon the facts uncovered in the past few hundred years as well as upon the universal elements of

religion. It must be capable of transmitting to oncoming generations the vast wealth of knowledge and vision which is our modern possession.

Religious humanism is not for the coward clergyman who fears his congregation and so uses the traditional terminology with a double meaning, his private interpretation and the common understanding of the terms. Religious humanism is not for the weak person who seeks refuge in authoritarian religion. Religious humanism is not for the individual who wishes to restrict religion to an emotional seance with the Eternal.

Religious humanism is for that brave and venturesome soul who would embark upon the sea of modern knowledge to find the truth. It is for the critically-minded man or woman who has seen through the subterfuge of orthodoxy and is not afraid to admit the extent of human ignorance regarding the origin and future of life. Religious humanism involves us in a vigorous commitment of our lives in the social struggles of our age. The main humanist contribution to religion has been that of exposing the weaknesses in supernaturalism, idealism and romanticism. As a humanist I am proud of the great work which has been done in the humanist movement toward a liberalizing of religion.

At the same time, let the humanist beware of an anthropomorphic humanism as well as an anthropomorphic theology! We must go beyond a man-centered humanism. The humanist emphasis upon man rather than the orthodox God has been a necessary corrective, but a man divorced from the very Nature which gave birth to him has no meaning. He is a lost soul!

The religion we need is a natural religion which recognizes that man is part of nature and that God or ultimate reality is too vast to be described simply. With the idealist we may glory in the rational part of human nature and in the value of Mind; with the Romanticist we would share in the distrust of a severe intellectualizing of religion, with the humanist we may agree on the painful inadequacies of supernatural religion.

Surely, there is a more wholesome level upon which both groups of contestants may stand. There is no place for dogmatism in religion or in science. That aspect of humanism which I term "religious humanism" or "natural religion" is a common ground and to it are welcomed all who seek the truth.

We always shall have immature persons in society. The majority of human society shall be forever immature, in all likelihood. Humanism is a religion for mature persons. It is a philosophy for that person who can no longer live under authori-

tarian religions and regimes. It is for some persons a last step before plunging into anarchy in a vain quest for individualism. The anarchist never has learned that freedom comes to one from collective security. (I do not use "collective security" in its now popular military sense.)

Discerning persons soon come to realize that under supernatural religion there cannot be normal development. The concept of God as a heavenly Father to whom we must constantly turn and from whom we must continually seek advice and guidance places severe limitations upon our progress toward spiritual maturity. It is with some regret that we may surrender our faith in the truthfulness of that concept, for we recognize that it has some utility also. We recognize the social values of a personalist theology. We are well aware of the danger of depersonalizing religion. We know that the family of today requires assistance so that it may remain together as a social unity. Our devotion, however, is not to utility. We are not opportunists. We seek for truth, and consequently it matters not how socially valuable certain religious concepts are, it matters not how much comfort religious rites may bring to the worshipper. If reality as we experience it, individually and collectively do not harmonize with the "heavenly Father" concept of the Cosmos we must change our religious vocabulary and bury the Personalist conception of God.

Such a burial event is filled with emotion, for it requires a rebirth of the individual into full intellectual and spiritual maturity, since a divorcement from supernatural religion is not without travail. Up to a point, our supernatural heritage prepared us for a transition to this new-found freedom. It brought us into socializing experiences in the church. It trained some of us to take positions of leadership, but it did not bring us to that position of full independence for which our hearts and minds hungered. There were always the questions which could not be asked and the answers which did not really answer.

Humanists need to remember that freedom has its responsibilities. It is our job to give leadership to the faltering wayward churches—those regressive institutions which are dedicated to fellowship but have no genuine sense of community and wherein indoctrination in supernaturalism is considered to be the "raison d'être". It is our task to put our liberal religious institutions to work on the real job, the education of adults to the nature of our universe, our society and the self. This is possible in only two of the so-called "Protestant denominations,"

Universalism and Unitarianism. Apparently, in only these two groups is it possible to redeem and to rededicate the church to humanitarian purposes and a mature philosophy of life. Only here can there be preached a religion of maturity. Many so-called "liberal" pulpits are filled with men who preach psychological calisthenics for neurotic spectators. Are we to say nothing of a theology and of a society which creates such neurotics?

There is no evidence for the claim often made by some humanists that human values and ideals are merely the invention of man. As a matter of fact, such a statement indicates the bias of the person making it and his implicit separation of man from nature. The structuring of life seems to involve values and ideals. Altho human societies differ somewhat in their respective values and ideals, each society does have them. Values and ideals have a natural place in life. Their development in human consciousness is a natural event.

540 W. Jefferson St., Naperville, Ill.

* * *

THE COMMON FRONT

By William Edward Zeuch

I

The great need of Humanists, Secularists, Ethical Culturists, libertarian Socialists and other modern groups is that they see the whole field of human relations down the centuries and around the present world; not largely and cursorily but rather completely and minutely.

The great fundamental problem across the ages and over most of the globe today has been and still is **EXPLOITATION**. We define exploitation as **the base use of human beings by powerful individuals and strong organizations for personal and institutional profit or advantage**. This evil is basic and central as compared with the fringe peccadillos that consume so much of the time and energy of dissenting groups. Exploitation has been the great challenge to ethical passion in every age; that ethical passion which has supplied the main drive for human social progress. It is still this same exploitation in various forms that holds back the advance of our present world civilization.

Historically, exploitation has been of many kinds—religious, political, economic, racial and social. Age after age over the millenniums priests and hierarchial organizations took advantage of the ignorance, fear and misery of the masses to levy tribute

to support themselves in style and to build sumptuous temples, churches and synagogues. They still keep up the practice as one may observe in all parts of the world today.

II

The rule of tribal chiefs, based on fear of violence, with their special privileges, evolved with time and changed circumstances into kinds with kingdoms, supported by burdensome taxation and other forced exactions, which in turn gave way to various kinds of States from the priest-kings in theocracies of biblical times down to modern dictatorships under the control of military cliques or militant minority political parties—all living in luxury on the backs of the people.

Direct economic exploitation based on fear of hunger and want, as distinguished from ecclesiastical and political exploitation, began with the exclusive control of the land by landlords, as under feudalism, to which was added later the monopolies of trading rights during the Middle Ages. Finally, during and after the Industrial Revolution, exploitation was based more and more on control of industries either because of patent rights or because the very giantism of industry made competition practically impossible.

Not only has religious exploitation endured into the present but the exploitation based on exclusive possession of lands on over population, on power sites, etc., and on the giantism and monopolies of Big Business are curses in almost all countries today. Industrial exploitation stalks every industrialized nation as well as the colonial dependencies of such industrialized nations. Racial exploitation, based on penalizing color of skin, is rampant in Africa and is not unknown in these United States. Political exploitation exists in the modern world wherever a nation maintains armed forces to dominate other nations or to subdue and keep in subjugation a portion of the domestic populace. Thus it is that the base use of human beings for personal or institutional profit or advantage is still a common curse.

III

In the face of this fundamental, world-wide challenge to righteousness there are some Humanists, Secularists and Ethical Culturists who are able to see only the religious exploitation. With one part of their minds they damn the exploitation based on ignorance, fear and misery of the masses while with other parts of their minds they either ignore, condone or approve the ex-

ploitation that attends the monopoly of force and violence that is the State, the monopoly inherent in the exclusive ownership of land, and the monopolies flowing from patents, concentration of capital and industrial giantism. Such Humanists, Secularists and Ethical Culturists can see the evil in taking advantage of the fear of a hereafter to sell salvation and a seat in heaven, both fictions of the imagination, of course, but they seem unable to see evil in profiting from political spoils and economic power.

IV

Communists have the effrontery to call themselves Humanists. They claim that they are out to destroy exploitation. They have tried to eliminate religious exploitation—let us give the Devil his due—not by enlightening ignorance but rather by substituting an economic dogma for a religious dogma. In the place of the gods they have put the materialistic dialectic. In the place of the Capitalist Class they have set up a Communist Party—a closed minority group that qualifies by accepting the Marxian dogma—a Party that exploits the base majority by means of a Terror and Butchery implemented by a pampered army and secret police force—so that members of the Party get the good houses, the best cars, the fine clothing and the luxury foods while the masses toil their lives away subsisting on the very lowest possible standard of living. It is for the reason of this vile exploitation, and not because of any economic theory, that Humanists and all other libertatians must fight that Communist Party wherever it exists. It is this line of struggle that makes possible a Common Front. The reason that Church, States and Business in the Western World hate and fight Communism is something else. Church, State and Business have always been in cahoots in the exploitation of the masses and they will not tolerate a Party as the exclusive exploiter. Hence the wars of West and East—hot and cold—and the impossibility of global existence.

V

The Common Front must be formed facing squarely all the agencies and institutions that batten on human exploitation. If any person, no matter how he labels himself, is so constituted that he cannot see the evil in the base use of human beings for personal and institutional profit and advantage, no matter where it exists or under what auspices it exists, he is intellectually and morally unfit to be classed as a Humanist. Humanists of all

kinds must see this basic issue clearly and see it whole and be possessed of the ethical passion to fight the good fight all along the line—in religion, in politics, in economics. Once this fundamental issue is fought out and won in the field of human relations it will be relatively easy to develop a civilization where we can consider our neighbors as ourselves. This would be ethical religion realized as contrasted with theological and other supernatural dogmas.

* * *

"One fact stands out in bold relief in the history of man's attempts for betterment. That is that when compulsion is used, only resentment is aroused, and in the end is not gained. Only through moral suasion and appeal to men's reason can a movement succeed."—Samuel Gompers.

* * *

CHURCH AND STATE NEWS REPORT

Part II—Continued from November Issue

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

By Glenn L. Archer

1633 Massachusetts Ave., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Tax Funds for Denominational Hospitals

The second type of violation to which I wish to call your attention is the direct or indirect payment of public money to religious institutions. This chiefly occurs in religious hospitals and religious schools. We hold that the Constitution is opposed to any such subsidy at taxpayers' expense, even when the motives of those who receive the subsidy are praiseworthy.

We admit that hospitals constitute a kind of borderline area in matters of church-state separation. But denominational hospitals are built and maintained like all other church institutions for the development of the church's influence in society and the extension of its message. The medical codes of some hospitals receiving federal and state money are narrowly denominational and discriminatory. When a hospital systematically promotes one sectarian faith and denies freedom to its patients, nurses and doctors in such matters as contraception, therapeutic abortion, and sterilization, it is not actually a public institution. It is a part of a church establishment, and contributions to such an institution help to promote the medical code of that particular church at public expense.

The chief federal violations of this sort occur under the Hill-Burton Act, which was passed before the Supreme Court had carefully analyzed—in the McCollum and Zorach cases—the limits of the use of public funds for religious enterprises. We believe that many of the appropriations made to denominational hospitals under that act would be outlawed under a strict application of the Supreme Court rulings. The Supreme Court, you will remember, said that “Neither a state nor the Federal Government . . . can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. . . . No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. . . .”

We believe that this rule should apply to all denominational hospitals. It applies with special force to that church which now receives about 80 per cent of the federal appropriations going to denominational hospitals. That church definitely forbids many medical measures which are permitted in non-Catholic hospitals. Frequently it discharges from its staffs doctors who do not conform to this denominational code. In such denominational hospitals certain established medical practices are definitely subordinated to canon law. The books of instruction for denominational nurses instruct them to discriminate in a specific way against patients who request the services of non-Catholic clergymen.

Of course, these violations are not exclusively Catholic. Some Protestant denominations accept public money for their hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act. We respect their motives, but in all consistency we oppose such appropriations as violations of the First Amendment. Some of the largest Protestant denominations, we are happy to say, notably the Southern Baptist churches, now reject such support for their hospitals from the public treasury as a violation of the First Amendment. Moreover, it should be pointed out in analyzing these violations, that Protestant hospitals, unlike Catholic institutions, do not have distinctly denominational medical codes. They do not discharge doctors for failing to follow the Methodist line on birth control, nor instruct Presbyterian nurses to refuse to call non-Presbyterian clergymen for the benefit of non-Presbyterian patients.

Bus Funds for Parochial Schools

We also consider that public appropriations to denominational religious schools for bus transportation are violations of the First Amendment, although these appropriations have been technically

legalized under certain circumstances by state law in some seventeen states. We are aware that in the *Everson* decision, by a vote of 5 to 4, the Supreme Court permitted the use of local funds for parochial school buses to reimburse Catholic parents for such costs, under carefully restricted conditions.

But the wisdom of such a concession can still be debated, and in the light of later decisions, even the legality. We believe that the decisions in the *McCollum* and *Zorach* cases, made after the *Everson* bus decision had been handed down, indicate that the four judges who dissented in the *Everson* case applied the First Amendment more rigorously and reasonably than the majority. We believe that if the issues should be re-argued in the light of all the local facts and all the principles enunciated in the *McCollum* and *Zorach* decisions, the appropriation of public funds for parochial-school bus transportation would be outlawed.

After all, bus transportation money for parochial schools is not like lunch money or expenditures for medical care. It is much more than a personal service to children as children. It is part of a competing school system which in turn is an organic and obligatory part of a church system. Of course, it is argued that the supplying of bus transportation to school children of religious schools contributes to their welfare, but it also contributes to the establishment of a church which has incorporated its religious schools into the church structure itself. To treat bus transportation for children in parochial schools as a detached welfare service is to be completely unrealistic. We would not spend tax money to transport people to church just because it contributed to their personal welfare. We would say that such use of public funds for religion violated the Constitution. So, when we consider appropriating public funds to parochial schools for bus transportation we should not think of the phenomenon in isolation. We should ask whether in making such payments we are really breaching the wall of separation between Church and State.

I think that this breach has been made and that bus appropriations are being used as a beachhead for a general invasion of the church-state separation principles of the First Amendment. We cannot ignore the fact that the largest church in America, which is the chief beneficiary of bus transportation at the present time, openly teaches that this concession in the granting of public revenue is a precedent for complete state aid in support of its schools. A leading religious magazine, *The Catholic World*, came out in April with an appeal to President Eisenhower, in which

it called the wall of separation between church and state "a legal pipe dream," and used the payment of public money for parochial-school bus transportation as a specific precedent for the demand for public money for new buildings for church schools. The editor argued that one concession without the other was illogical and discriminatory. In asking for public funds for Catholic school buildings he declared that "there is nothing sectarian about heating equipment, windows and a roof over the children's heads." It is because bus transportation for parochial school pupils is being used in this manner as an argument for the annulment of the establishment clause of the First Amendment that we regard bus appropriations as contrary to the constitutional principles of church-state separation.

How Religious Favoritism Works

The third type of violation which we wish to discuss is religious favoritism in the administration and enforcement of the law. In many cases this favoritism violates the rights of citizens under both the First and Fourteenth Amendments. It is especially prevalent in the field of education.

In many states laws are written on the statute books requiring that denominational schools must give their pupils the equivalent of the education given in public schools. The equality of education is supposed to be a condition of acceptance of denominational schools under our compulsory education laws. In general these laws are not well enforced. The subject is too long for adequate treatment here, but we wish to file with the committee a survey which our organization made in 1954, which shows that many religious schools in the country are not being compelled to live up to the standards prescribed by law. Of course, we do not question the right of churches to operate their own school systems, but we believe that if the education in these private systems is accepted as satisfactory under our compulsory education laws, the parochial school authorities should be compelled to live up to the law. At the present time they are the beneficiaries of studied favoritism and continuing laxity on the part of state school officers who are supposed to see that they meet the standard requirements for public schools.

Another type of violation based on religious favoritism occurs in the discriminatory administration of the income-tax laws. Protestant and Jewish public school teachers do not receive the same income-tax exemptions as Catholic sisters. The sisters are not compelled to pay an income tax on their salaries as public

school teachers; Protestant and Jewish teachers in parallel circumstances are compelled to pay. In Frenchburg, Kentucky, for example, nine public school teachers of United Presbyterian faith received their salaries from the county, turned their checks over to the Presbyterian missionary society which operated part of the school, and took back just enough for their living expenses. Seven teachers of the same church affiliation in the Ezel school in Morgan County, Kentucky, did the same thing. All sixteen of these teachers were compelled to pay full income tax on their full salary checks. They have discontinued the practice of turning over their pay checks in this manner, but so far as we know, they have not received refunds for past payments.

We do not know what the total national loss from this discriminatory practice amounts to because there are no national statistics on teaching sisters in public schools, but we can estimate the loss in some regions. In Dubois County, Indiana, for example, there are 65 sisters on the public school payroll teaching in schools that are Catholic in personnel and spirit, and public in name. The government's loss in that one county because of income-tax discrimination is estimated at more than \$32,000 a year.

But one of the oddities of the present situation is that in some parts of the United States public schools make deductions for income taxes from the salary checks of sisters, and in most parts of the country they do not. We are told, for example, that in Huntingburg, Indiana, one of the towns in Dubois County, such deductions are made. We think that this committee should make a careful investigation of this situation to see whether teaching sisters are quietly receiving refunds of these deductions without any public disclosure of the practice.

We contend that the legal excuse for this system of tax discrimination is absurd, and that the reasoning of the United States Department of Internal Revenue on the subject is clearly discriminatory. A sister who is employed as a teacher by an American public school must be employed as an independent contractor for her own labor. A state or city cannot possibly employ a religious order directly without violating the law. The teaching sister's income must legally come to rest, for at least an instant when she endorses her pay check over to the head of her religious order. At that instant, by all normal interpretations of law, she owes a federal income tax to the government on her public-school salary. A sister cannot be an independent contractor for

the purpose of employment and at the same time be treated solely as an agent for her church when the income-tax collector arrives.

Give Us Protective Laws

I believe that the three types of violations which I have summarized should be met by both court action and legislative action. Of course, many of the abuses I have cited can be rectified by state legislatures and local courts. But there is also a challenge and an opportunity for action by Congress. Since you have specifically asked our organization to indicate the nature of any Congressional remedies which we favor, I should like to suggest that the three following legislative remedies are worthy of your consideration:

1. We believe that every federal law appropriating money for education should contain a specific provision that no portion of the funds voted may go to sectarian religious institutions, either for buildings, salaries or bus transportation.

2. We believe that the Hill-Burton Act should be amended to prevent appropriations to any denominational hospitals.

3. We believe that in appropriation bills for the Executive branch of the government and for the State Department, specific provisions should be included prohibiting any employment of a public or secret fund for either a personal representative or an official ambassador to the Vatican. This would prevent the president from circumventing the will of Congress and the American people by giving distinctive recognition to one church.

Appendix

Here is the official documentary evidence to prove that the Roman Catholic Church, in its own publications, (1) attempts to enforce a boycott of public schools; (2) demands full support out of the public treasury for its own schools as a matter of "distributive justice"; and (3) promotes its own teachings in tax-supported institutions.

1. The Boycott of Public Schools

Canon 1374 of Roman Catholic Canon Law (with comment from Bouscaren and Ellis' Canon Law, p. 704):

Catholic children may not attend non-Catholic, neutral or mixed schools, that is, those which are open also to non-Catholics, and it pertains exclusively to the Ordinary of the place to decide, in accordance with instructions of the Holy See, under what cir-

cumstances and with what precautions against the danger of perversion, attendance at such schools may be tolerated.

Instruction of the Holy Office, Nov. 24, 1875, concerning Catholic parents who refuse to send their children to Catholic schools as quoted in Canon Law, p. 706:

Parents who neglect to give this necessary Christian training and education to their children, or who permit them to attend schools where spiritual ruin is inevitable, or finally who, although there is a suitable Catholic school properly equipped and ready in the locality, or, although they have means of sending their children elsewhere to receive a Catholic education, nevertheless without sufficient reason and without the necessary safeguards to make the proximate danger remote send them to the public schools—such parents, if they are contumacious, obviously according to Catholic moral doctrine cannot be absolved in the Sacrament of Penance.

The Brooklyn Tablet, published the following answer on the sin of sending Catholic children to public schools. (Brooklyn Tablet, April, 1954, Question Box of Father Raymond J. Neufeld):

Q. Is it a sin for Catholic parents not to send their children to Catholic schools?

A. Catholics are excused from this obligation only when there is no way of fulfilling the law. The Code of Canon Law (1372) obliges all Catholic parents, as well as those who take their place, to provide for the Christian education of their children. In elementary school, all children, according to their age, must be instructed in Christian Doctrine. Furthermore, those who attend the higher schools are to receive further religious training. In addition, the Code forbids Catholic parents sending their children to non-Catholic schools, even public. Attendance at these schools can only be tolerated.

Every practical Catholic parent wants to see his children educated according to the provisions of the Code. The big problem in recent years is one of numbers and crowded conditions in our Catholic schools, both elementary and high. Therefore, parents who have to send their children to public schools are not guilty of a violation of the law. They must, on that account, be more watchful and conscientious about the religious training of these children, seeing to it that they attend the parochial confraternity classes for both elementary and high school pupils.

2. The Demand for Public Funds for Catholic Schools

Statement of National Catholic Welfare Conference to subcommittee of House committee on Education and Labor on Federal Aid to Education, 1947, pp 310, 311.

The financing of schools through public taxation is a responsibility of government, especially of local and State governments. This responsibility entails an obligation to observe the norms of distributive justice in distributing tax funds among the schools within the community. Since government itself has nothing to teach, and because government receives a full return from its educational investment when a school produces well-trained citizens, therefore, every school to which parents may send their children in compliance with the compulsory education laws of the State is entitled to a fair share of tax funds. Local and State governments which refuse to support schools not under the control of the local school board are guilty of an injustice against other qualified schools within the community.

Canon Law: A Text and Commentary, by T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S. J., and Adam C. Ellis, S. J., p. 574:

State laws which result directly or indirectly in depriving Catholic children of Catholic education are against the natural law. Catholics should be so instructed in this matter that they will exercise all legal means to remedy this grave injustice. The system of taxation which burdens Catholic citizens with the support of so-called "public" schools which Catholics may not in conscience attend, is an evident violation of fundamental justice.

The 1952 National Catholic Almanac, p. 357:

In the United States the use of local, state or federal tax funds to support denominational schools is prohibited by law. State constitutions and laws explicitly forbid state tax aid to any school giving sectarian instruction. The United States Supreme Court has ruled that the First Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits federal aid to sectarian schools.

Catholic authorities maintain that these two laws are unjust and discriminatory because they arbitrarily deny tax aid to schools, which, like the public schools, prepare for the responsibilities of American citizenship. They see no reason why the inclusion of religious instruction in a school's curriculum should deprive it of tax support as long as the school complies fully with all the requirements of compulsory education laws.

Pope Pius XII, "Address to Teaching Sisters," September 15, 1951 (text in Brooklyn Tablet, November 3, 1951):

Therefore, we may add, and not only in regard to Italy but speaking in general: from those who have a part in drawing up school legislation, we must expect that determination for justice, that, so to speak, democratic sense which corresponds to the will of the parents in such a way that the schools founded and directed by religious institutes be not placed in a worse condition than the State schools and that they be given the freedom which is necessary for their development.

* * *

THE GREAT LAND RACKET GAMBLING IN LAND VALUES IN U. S. A.

By Paul Blanshard

I am aware that it is only from the community's point of view that making a profit from increased land values can be described as a racket. From the point of view of the individual buyers and sellers of land, any given transaction is simply a trading of values in which the buyer pays only what he thinks the land is worth to him. By all our canons of trade, the seller is entitled to keep all the increased value that has been created by the community, and in that right he is supported by law and religion, the army and the navy. The same moral justification could be developed for private profit in air if, at the beginning of our civilization, some bold entrepreneurs had staked out the continent and started to collect a tax for the right to breathe in any given area. Any individual seller of breathing rights could point out that his profits were not racketeering profits because he had paid hard-earned cash for them. The meaning of the air-racket would appear only when the basic rights to private ownership in the air were examined. As Herbert Spencer pointed out, we cannot justify the capture of land values by profiteers except by a new kind of calculus which determines the rate at which a wrong becomes a right.

William Penn was one of our great land-racketeers, and he blazed a trail for his successors. Although he was an incompetent businessman, his devices for skimming the cream from land values have been almost universally adopted by the subdivision realtors. Without expending any money himself, he acquired forty-seven million acres of land in payment of a royal debt to his father, and so became the world's greatest private

landowner. Then he divided up the land into sections and reserved for himself the choicest tenth of each section. Also, as each township was laid out, he took for himself an extra five hundred acres. In the end, the influx of settlers made these reserved sections highly valuable.

Mr. Penn was not unique. His tactics as a realtor were practiced quite generally by other colonial leaders. Enormous grants of land were made by the British king to subjects who had become royal creditors of one sort or another, and these creditors were allowed to divide the territory on their own terms.

The pioneers of America, it should be remembered, were people who had failed to establish themselves as successful economic beings in their original environment. For such people, self-critical, discontented, it became necessary to establish some little island of self-satisfaction as a compensation for social defeat. Landownership was, naturally enough, their beautiful isle of somewhere.

The ill-effects of this policy did not become apparent until the growth of cities. Then gradually we became a nation of realtors. The whole conception of land changed from something to be used, to something to be held until the community should increase its value. Landownership in the New World became a national racket in which the shrewd, the foresighted, the lucky, and the grandsons of grandfathers stood at the key cross-roads of our bustling new city life and extracted toll from every tenant, purchaser of chocolate-sodas in a drug store, purchaser of toasted cigarettes in a cigar store, purchaser of ladies' and misses' dresses.

An extensive new jargon of Progress developed which in almost every instance could be traced to the realtor. The idea was almost universally accepted that the chief purpose of a city was to grow, not because the people therein would gain any new happiness, but because land values would rise. Communities were planned with the notion that multitudes of people should be poured through the funnel of narrow, downtown business streets so that they would buy at certain stores and raise the value of the land on which those stores were situated. In cities like New York, grass became bucolic and clean air absolutely unknown. In all our cities, moral obtuseness became more dense as the distinction between earned and unearned income decreased. Productive work became more and more socially disgraceful, until the old-time respectable class of artisans almost disappeared and the adjective "substantial" was

reserved for those who extracted from the community a substantial unearned revenue.

The realtors are intensely proud of what they have done to American cities because they have succeeded in convincing themselves that the agglomeration of multitudes of over-heated, irritable, and tired persons on fabulously valuable land is Progress.

The most successful and respectable method of toll-gathering in America is to purchase land at a metropolitan cross-road and then to sit there while the rest of the world goes by. So every home-owner becomes a potential racketeer and dreams of the time when the madding crowd will hold sway on his particular street and make it necessary for him to part with his modest lot for fifteen times its purchase price. And the realtor is not slow in nourishing that dream.

Occasionally a whole State approaches financial insanity in the scramble to occupy the vantage points of the land-racket, as Florida and California bear witness. The Florida realtors were so absorbed in their occupation of land-gambling that when the great hurricane of 1926 broke over the State, John Barton Payne, Chairman of the American Red Cross, declared that "The poor people who suffered are regarded as of less importance than the hotel and tourist business," and Florida boosters sent out thousands of letters and telegrams to the North declaring that the damage of the hurricanes was very slight.

It is a form of this land-gambling mania which lies at the root of the American farmers' poverty today. The farmer should estimate the value of his land by the net income that he receives from selling the things that he grows, but, inoculated by the realtors' virus, he tacks on to this basic value a whole superstructure of dreams. He dreams that the city will move out his road, that his well will yield health-water, that the crazy war-time prices for wheat will continue. These dreams are congealed into watered values, and he pays rent upon them in the form of interest to the banker on an inflated mortgage. Complete disillusionment does not come, because from time to time some farmer actually cashes in upon his dreams. The city moves toward him, and he is privileged to act as a toll-gatherer from the eager little bank clerks and the bustling young bond salesmen who flee to the suburbs for country air. The stark poverty and the awful insecurity of agricultural production are endured with more or less patience by millions of American farmers because they are emotionally nourished and sustained by the hope of some day becoming land-racketeers themselves.

—Republished from The New Freeman

IS THE CIVIL CALENDAR AMENDABLE?

Science is defined as the sum of universal knowledge. Upon any scientific effort the sum of knowledge today may be altered upon the morrow. This is outstandingly true of the science of calendar planning. In fact, even as late as our day, the sum of knowledge in the intermineable field of calendarization may be only weakly referred to as scientific. This is because astronomical, economic, political and social factors combine to confuse the planner who may depend upon one important requirement to the exclusion of remaining ones.

In reality, astronomical foundations provide only one essential element in the formation of a useful or workable calendar. Neither may technologically accurate calendarization accord such a form of almanac expression. Pre-eminent uses among the people may easily offset numerous scientific considerations.

Especially is this true insofar as religious usages are involved, which are always a subject for intense consideration in the formation of a Civil calendar. Industrial or economic requirements may bring to bear moral as well as material pressures upon political, religious and social traditions, however, that exert unexpected action for calendar transitions. This is undoubtedly true of our present highly industrialized, mathematically precise "golden age".

The modern age, more than all ages before it, is bringing itself to bear upon this problem of civil calendarization. Peremptorily, it is flinging its own challenge in the face of leftover calendar traditions of medieval or antiquitarian periods. An overstrain induced by industrial and economic progression tends to stress action upon the part of all brackets of society for a reform of the present obsolete or decadent calendar usage.

Conditions in the present Occidental, and other world systems, that to other or former peoples presented no problems are, today, subjects for serious and deliberate action for a thorough-going calendar revision. Particularly, in the industrial and political brackets, the recognition of a state of chaos in the calendar is paced by numerous and insistent proposals for reform. Groups over the international field are stressing need for finality, uniformity and progressiveness in the calendar system.

In a word, this signifies a demand for a coordinated system of day-dates, weeks and months within the calendar chart. It signifies, also, a demand for a solitary calendar form for measuring identical solar years through centuries, millenniums, even

eons of time. Colloquially, the rank and file are saying, "We, too, are filled up with the mess within the calendar."

Globally assessed, the trend for an improved and global usage of the calendar has led to an enlargement of the sum of knowledge upon calendarization. This knowledge embraces a general concept concerning the nature of an adequate and scientific calendar.

Calendar knowledge is, therefore, fast becoming a universal art among our people who sense in their calendar a factor affecting their lives, liberties and happinesses. However, this knowledge, although it suggests a universal information, does not preclude the presence of insidious obstacles resulting from a lethargic state with traditions, political, religious and social. There is no question that the pressures of our age are tending greatly to assuage the effectiveness of these traditions, of course. Universality of knowledge does not effect, it seems, a unanimity of agreement upon the part of all elements of world peoples.

Nonetheless, the planting of the seeds of knowledge are bringing forth plants of wisdom, and with their ripening and ingathering the way should be opened for amending the Civil Chart.

Interested readers may contact the author, Fee Clifford Esteb, P. O. Box 601, Walla Walla, Wash.

* * *

A Meditation

Here lies the power of our way—not in making the whole world Unitarian or Universalist, but in helping ourselves and others to see some of the possibilities inherent in viewpoints other than one's own, in encouraging the free interchange of ideas, in welcoming fresh approaches to the problems of life in urging the fullest most vigorous use of critical self-examination.—Adlai E. Stevenson.

* * *

Quote of the Week

"Probably the present American taboo against what is called 'religious controversy' is as bad for religion as it is for atheism. It means that the great concepts of religion are rarely discussed frankly in public by serious, independent thinkers. Religious literature suffers too much tenderness; it lacks vitality and vigor. It is wrapped in the sterilized cotton wool of hypocritical respect."

—Paul Blanshard in *The Right to Read*, Beacon Press, \$3.50

(Filed October 21, 1955)

(C O P Y)

In the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Frank C. Hughes, Plaintiff

vs.

Ivy Baker Priest, as
Treasurer of the
United States

C O M P L A I N T

Civil Action , File No. 4681-55

1. The action arises under the "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.
2. The United States has in its employ and on its payrolls, in the Armed Forces and other departments of Government, thousands of persons called Chaplains, engaged to teach and practice religion.
3. The employment of such Chaplains is contrary to The Constitution of the United States as set forth by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Everson v. Board of Education* (1947), 33 U. S. 1, and reaffirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in *McCullum v. Board of Education* (1948), 333 U. S. 23, as follows:

"The 'establishment of religion' clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between church and State'."

4. In the payment of Federal Income Taxes, plaintiff is forced to pay a part of the salaries and allowances to Chaplains on the Federal payroll, in violation of that part of the Everson decision quoted in Paragraph 3 above which provides that "No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

5. The revenue to pay the cost of Chaplains in the service of the United States comes, in part at least, from taxes. In paying Income Taxes assessed against him, plaintiff is forced to pay a part of the cost of promulgating religious doctrines which he abhors, and is obliged to support, financially, religion entirely alien to his own. Thus plaintiff is denied the freedom of religion guaranteed under Amendment I of The Constitution of the United States.

Wherefore plaintiff demands that the defendant, her officers, agents, servants, employees, and their successors in office be permanently enjoined by this Honorable Court from paying any salaries or allowances from the funds of the United States Government to any Chaplain, active or retired, employed or previously employed by the United States to teach or practice religion.

Frank C. Hughes, Plaintiff
and Attorney pro se

Address: Leamington Hotel
3rd Avenue South at 10th St.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

* * *

BOOK REVIEW

By Kathryn Weller
(Now Is the Time, by Lillian Smith)

Miss Smith has dedicated her book to children everywhere and she hopes that the Supreme Court decision, based on the important truth of a child's right to learn, which abolished legal racial segregation in our public schools will serve as a springboard to bring about the end of all racial segregation.

Miss Smith also supports the thesis that Communism is winning Asia because democracy has become "white democracy" in the eyes of Asia and Africa. The United States will not be accepted as a friend there partly because we cling to color segregation and even have laws in some of our states making it compulsory.

What is segregation? It means separation, and it has often been practiced of necessity and with good results. For instance, we separate those with contagious diseases from the well; the young from the old for educational purposes; and a disaster area from adjacent land in order to administer first aid and safety measures. Such segregation as this is freely accepted; its purpose is creative; and, most important, its duration is limited. "Segregation can be right or wrong depending on the length of time it is used. However valid its purpose . . . it becomes wrong when used too long." We cannot go our way alone because we need each other's concern and acceptance. "All morality is based on life's central truth: that men in their different ways must meet each other's needs, and in the doing of it will find a larger, a freer life for themselves."

Tracing the beginnings of our foolish ideas and behaviour, Miss Smith points out that there was little dislike and fear of colored people when the white race first came in contact with her. It was only after slavery was well established in our country and the Christian American began to feel the conflict between his religious beliefs and economic practices that he began to insist that the white race was superior. In some way this seemed to justify the subordination and shameful treatment of colored people.

The Civil War ended slavery but the turbulent reconstruction period which followed brought about many serious problems. The politicians of the day, in order to maintain a white machine, went to any lengths to keep Negroes from voting. To do it legally, they incited the people to pass the necessary legislation. In this way segregation statutes were passed "to control racial violence." As signs went up over doors in the South segregation began to spread through minds and homes, schools and churches, newspapers and books. It spread until 21 of our 48 states had legal race barriers, and in the others (where most of us live) "feelings hardened into gentlemen's agreements which began to write housing covenants, to create ghettos, to restrict hotels and restaurants, to determine what was said about segregation and intermarriage in magazines with national circulation—and, later, in motion pictures—to set up barriers in fraternities in northern universities and professional societies."

Thus the pattern was set and during this period only two men were brave enough to object, Gen. Robert E. Lee and George Washington Cable, a novelist who fought in the Civil War. Their words were not heeded. While there were some who

abhorred the violence and hate and tried to teach their children not to hate, they would not speak out. Nor would they allow others to speak out, for "their precarious moral equilibrium could be maintained only if no one questioned what was being done." If an occasional minister dared to discuss these things he soon lost his post. Thus did the South try to defend the morally indefensible.

Eventually democracy began to grow again. New respect was gained for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and for the brilliant work of its Legal Committee in securing the rights of Negroes. Negroes found that within the framework of American law they could reclaim their constitutional rights. Finally, on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court decision about public schools left no place for any form of legal segregation in our nation.

Color segregation has not been a problem in our country alone. It and its brother colonialism have possibly been the greatest aid to the Communist conspiracy which moves steadily across Asia. "No American who has not seen it can grasp the extent and acuteness of the poverty . . . of Asia. We have never, in any part of our nation at any time, experienced the extreme deprivation which is a common thing in Asia. The colonial powers did not bring this poverty, but by their exploitation of people and resources they increased it. They did not bring ignorance, but they did nothing to alleviate it. Asians and Africans have suffered a shame and humiliation and injury whose depths Americans—even Negro Americans—have not known."

Although the United States has not actively opposed colonization and we have profited from the practice, for the most part our record in the treatment of Asians and Africans is fairly clean. Why then do they distrust us and our democracy? Because as long as we have legal segregation inside our nation we are a "white democracy" to the Asians and Africans. "As long as we practice segregation against colored people, as long as there are signs over doors in this land, as long as there are laws in any of the states making race segregation compulsory, as long as our officials make insulting public statements about the darker people, Asians and Africans will not trust us."

We, as the strongest nation on earth, should lead the way to a world of peace, where all nations can work together freely, but with responsibility toward others. But, how can we lead the way when we cling to color segregation? Now is the time for us to eliminate it from our lives completely and to "take

from the demagogues' hands forever a weapon too dangerous for this atomic age."

"A Million Years of Human Progress," is a book which gives a summation of world affairs, past and present. It presents a record of human progress, a record that shows man as he is today and a peek at his future. We found it interesting and profitable reading.—The Editor.

Albert Einstein spoke of it as a very valuable book.

The author, Ira D. Cardiff, 709 N. First Ave., Yakima, Wash., Price \$2.50.

* * *

DAVIDSON BEGINS PRISON SENTENCE

At 1:30 p.m., December 5, 1955, Vern George Davidson surrendered to federal authorities in Los Angeles to begin serving a three-year term for refusing induction into the Armed Forces of the United States. His surrender climaxed a three-year legal struggle to have his rights as a conscientious objector recognized under law.

Socialists everywhere have been shocked by the case. His friends and family have been deeply saddened. His act of resistance will not be forgotten. It is even more important that it not be misunderstood.

Why did Davidson choose prison instead of serving in the Armed Forces? He answered this question in a statement which was printed in the UCLA student paper in December, 1953, shortly after his arrest. We quote part of it:

"Through totalitarian forces face free men everywhere, I realize that totalitarianism could not be stopped by guns. Only a dynamic program of the American people in cooperation with all of the world's peoples, to settle economic problems could possibly lead to peace.

"I believe such a program impossible as long as we are turning our resources to guns instead of butter. I can't cooperate with a government that uses totalitarianism to fight totalitarianism . . . The hysteria of war preparation increasingly resembles the evil that the war effort is supposed to combat.

"My own answer to totalitarianism is to join with free men everywhere in working peacefully to combat it. If this means opposition to the draft and loyalty oaths in my own country, then I will oppose them. If this means going to prison, I will

go. I have faith that men . . . will in the end attain freedom throughout the world. By going to prison I shall remain free, and on the offensive for a free world."

There is a terrible eloquence in the silence of the imprisoned. Every day that Vern Davidson is behind bars makes a mockery of this government's talk of freedom. Every day he is behind bars is a grim reminder to all Socialists that capitalism is a source of war and tyranny which must be abolished.

You can: write President Eisenhower, urging an unconditional pardon for all objectors now imprisoned.

There is still \$251 to be paid on the defense costs. Funds can be sent to: Davidson Defense Committee, 9121 S. Dalton Ave., L. A. —S.N., L.A.

Editorial Note: Your Editor met and discussed the above matter with Mr. Davidson and it would appear that he has been convicted under a section of the Selective Service Act which denies a conscientious objector his Constitutional rights, as are set up in the First Amendment, namely, "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or the free exercise thereof."

* * *

NOTES FROM THE RAMS HORN

Dr. Harold Scott

A Parable

Once upon a time there was a pastor who thought the object of religion was to protect and promote the happiness of the people both today and for the generations to come. So he studied all proposals he could that had to do with human welfare. Of course, that involved the study of legislative proposals and politics.

But many of his good people wished he wouldn't "preach politics." So he moved on and another pastor was called who was deaf, blind, and dumb as to politics. The people liked that. They called it being "spiritual."

Science and Religion—Old Hat

It well may be that when the history of this period is written one hundred years hence that the great crime of this century was that the scientists without any safeguard turned over the new nuclear weapons of destruction to politicians and the military. There may be a footnote that the churches were too busy building new buildings to protest.

There Was No Reform

Sloppy newspaper reporting has given the American people the impression that congress has reformed the procedures of its investigative committees. It has not. This is the situation in the words of Congressman Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Republican, Pa.

It would allow a committee to circulate derogatory information from its confidential files without notice to the individual concerned and without giving him an opportunity to explain or deny the defamatory material.

It would allow a committee to make public defamatory testimony given at an executive session without notice of hearing to the person defamed.

It would allow a committee to issue a public report defaming individuals or groups without notice of hearing.

It would not allow a person under investigation to cross-examine a witness accusing him at a public hearing.

It would not entitle a witness even to 24 hours' advance notice of a hearing at which his career or reputation would be at stake.

It would not prevent the committee from sitting as a legislative court, trying guilt or innocence of individuals, or inquiring into matters wholly unrelated to any function or activity of the U. S. government. Ref. I. F. Stone's Weekly, \$5 a year.

* * *

"There is a life that is worth living now as it was worth living in the former days, and that is the honest life, the useful life, the unselfish life, cleansed by devotion to an ideal. There is a battle that is worth fighting now as it was worth fighting then, and that is the battle for justice and equality; to make our city and our state free in fact as well as in name; to break the rings that strangle real liberty and to keep them broken; to cleanse, so far as in our power lies, the fountains of our national life from political, commercial and social corruption; to teach our sons and daughters, by precept and example, the honor of serving such a country as America—that is work worthy of the finest manhood and womanhood. The wellborn are those who are born to do that work; the wellbred are those who are bred to be proud of that work; the well-educated are those who see deepest into the meaning and the necessity of that work. Nor shall their labor be for naught, nor the reward of their sacrifice fail them; for high in the firmament of human destiny are set the stars of faith in mankind, and unselfish courage and loyalty to the ideal."—Henry Van Dyke.

THE MEMBERSHIP ROLL CALL

Man throughout the ages has been the victim of the fear of the unknown. The Voodoo man or the Priest, rather than unshackle man from these fears of the unknown, have continued their diabolical methods to keep man's mind and body under subjection. In early times human sacrifice, then the rack and the screw, and in our times so-called brain-washing and the attendant fear of association, etc.

To correct these wrongs, we ask that these powers, who have built these great castles with their foundations on the quicksands of time, cooperate with all mankind for a free and democratic world, founded on the understanding way of the scientific method. It is a demand of the Atomic Age.

International science has made the world one neighborhood, Religious Humanism is the foundation upon which it shall be made one Brotherhood. This is a compelling cause, with room for all.

* * *

For \$1.00 you can subscribe to the Humanist World Digest for a year, or send it to a friend. It will be a Missionary toward man's objective approach for his survival here. We would like to have you answer the Roll Call. Also, we will thank you for the names of those you think might like to know about this magazine.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Please enter my subscription to the Humanist World Digest foryears at \$1 per year.

(Add gift subscriptions on separate sheet)

Membership Form (Dues include Digest subscription)

I wish to apply for membership in the Humanist World Fellowship and enclose \$..... to cover annual dues, as indicated.

Check () \$5 Regular () \$10 Contributing

One () \$25 Sustaining () \$100 or more, Sponsor

Total amount enclosed: \$.....

NAME

ADDRESS

(Please type or print)

Mail to: **HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST**

1011 Heinz Avenue - Berkeley 2, California

INTERPRETING HUMANIST OBJECTIVES

HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP is a religious association incorporated under the laws of the State of California with all the rights and privileges of such organizations. It enrolls members, charters local societies, affiliates like-minded groups, establishes educational projects and ordains ministers.

HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP defines religion in terms of two inseparable historical processes: (1) the ages-long quest for ultimate human values; and (2) the continuous effort to realize these values in individual experience and in just and harmonious social relations. Humanism affirms the inviolable dignity of the individual and declares democracy the only acceptable method of social progress.

MODERN HUMANISM seeks to unite the whole of mankind in ultimate religious fellowship. It strives for the integration of the whole personality and the perfection of social relationships as the objectives of religious effort. Humanism, in broad terms, tries to achieve a good life in a good world. **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** is a shared quest for that good life.

Above all, man is not to be regarded as an instrument that serves and glorifies totalitarianism — economic, political or ecclesiastical.

HUMANISM insists that man is the highest product of the creative process within our knowledge, and as such commands our highest allegiance. He is the center of our concern. He is not to be treated as a means to some other end, but as an end in himself. Heretofore man has been considered a means to further the purposes of gods, states, economic systems, social organizations; but Humanism would reverse this and make all these things subservient to the fullest development of the potentialities of human nature as the supreme end of all endeavor. This is the cornerstone of Humanism, which judges all institutions according to their contribution to human life.

HUMANISM recognizes that all mankind are brothers with a common origin. We are all of one blood with common interests and a common life and should march with mutual purposes toward a common goal. This means that we must eradi-

cate racial antagonisms, national jealousies, class struggles, religious prejudices and individual hatreds. Human solidarity requires that each person consider himself a cooperating part of the whole human race striving toward a commonwealth of man built upon the principle of justice, good will and service.

HUMANISM seeks to understand human experience by means of human inquiry. Despite the claims of revealed religions, all of the real knowledge acquired by the race stems from human inquiry. Humanists investigate facts and experience, verify these, and formulate thought accordingly. However, nothing that is human is foreign to the Humanist. Institutions, speculations, supposed supernatural revelations are all products of some human mind so must be understood and evaluated. The whole body of our culture — art, poetry, literature, music, philosophy and science must be studied and appreciated in order to be understood and appraised.

HUMANISM has no blind faith in the perfectibility of man but assumes that his present condition, as an individual and as a member of society, can be vastly improved. It recognizes the limitations of human nature but insists upon developing man's natural talents to their highest point. It asserts that man's environment, within certain limits, can be arranged so as to enhance his development. Environment should be brought to bear on our society so as to help to produce healthy, sane, creative, happy individuals in a social structure that offers the most opportunity for living a free and full life.

HUMANISM accepts the responsibility for the conditions of human life and relies entirely upon human efforts for their improvement. Man has made his own history and he will create his own future—for good or ill. The Humanist determines to make this world a fit place to live in and human life worth living. This is a hard but challenging task. It could result gloriously.

These brief paragraphs indicate the objectives and methods of **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** as a religious association. Upon the basis of such a program it invites all like-minded people into membership and communion. Let us go forward together.



Starr King Ministerial College
University of California
Berkeley, Calif. (K)